

January 4, 1967

Must Remain in  
Transcription Room

Next week will be the last Sunday again for a couple of other weeks for the rest of January and probably the beginning of February. I think the first of February is on a Wednesday. I don't think I'll be back by that time yet. So after next week - for three Wednesdays, no Wednesday meetings. But it is the same kind of an arrangement that we had before that anyone who ~~is~~ really <sup>is</sup> interested in Work or the ideas of Gurdjieff can come to a general meeting which will be held on Mondays - Mondays at eight o'clock. So those of you who want to profit by that or think that they cannot live without attending a meeting a week - there's your opportunity.

Who's new tonight <sup>wh?</sup> - what, sitting way back, can you hear? I can't see you. Can you hear when I <sup>uea?</sup> speak - some of the vacationists are back again - Boston - and Ronnie - good for you Ronnie.

Now what will we talk about. You know - I always feel a little inclined in having to ~~explain~~ <sup>f</sup> why we meet because it is like a free meeting - a getting together to talk about something that is important - at least important from my standpoint - although it may not be as important for you or they may of course be different degrees of importance in different people. And even if I say - yes we want to talk about affairs that really matter - in that sense then - are important - with an emphasis on the possibility of that what's <sup>not</sup> only is surface appearance and manifestation <sup>but</sup> and many times what are the motivations for ones manifestations - the way one is and behaves and whatever one does or feels and thinks in ordinary life - that that has to be tinted or at least colored a little bit with a certain quality which for lack of a better word we might call more essential and in a general way - the emphasis then on any kind of a discussion like ~~for~~ tonight will have to be based on a realization of the

existence of at least two forms of life or rather a different gradation of life so that life is not only surface matter and that there has to be in each person something that goes a little deeper and I call that more essential and <sup>of course</sup> also would in the last instance be much more real. Now where one draws the line- where the difference is between this outer life - this outer appearance and one's inner <sup>life</sup> I think is very difficult to say how far you have to go before you reach an inner quality and that the only way to explain it is that more and more I go away from the surface and more and more it becomes real for me - more important it will become and <sup>that</sup> finally I will find myself in a region that I'm not so much used to or even if I know that it exists - that I'm not so willing <sup>to</sup> parade with it or to let it come out or to make it apparent also to other people. And the reason for that may be many. Sometimes I'm a little ashamed or sometimes I think that it belongs to my private life and it's nobody else's business or that sometimes I think it is not necessary and of course how far this inner quality can really go and to what extent each person is able to express it and how they express it - how they are then in ordinary life - whatever their behavior may be - and to what extent they are using the different means by which they - in general - all of us communicate with each other. How much is necessary to emphasize <sup>sometimes</sup> a different kind of <sup>a</sup> quality than only the surface and with how much one is really satisfied by living at a certain place and taking things in as <sup>when</sup> they come and as they go out without any further thought. So you see <sup>one</sup> <sup>we</sup> (will) start to deepen ones life a little bit and how far one wants to go depends entirely on the necessity that <sup>I think</sup> I have to do it in order to establish for myself a better equilibrium or perhaps that I will be more at ease with myself - the more I can really live at least partly in an inner condition of myself and <sup>also</sup> at times wish to express it - depends entirely on the kind of level which our personality occupies at the present time. And that level- ~~I~~ simply call a level of being and naturall

it is made up of the different functions of myself and which functions at certain times I consider more or less important and that those people who become my friends correspond to my level of being <sup>when</sup> and I have at least a relationship with them so that there is an even exchange. It does not mean that all the relations have to be even ~~th~~ and have to be on the same kind of a level because of course there are many relationships where one is a little higher and the other lower or reverse and all of that naturally if it is <sup>all</sup> added ~~all~~ up together - comes out to a certain point where I say - I live at this time - at that kind of a level, again - it doesn't mean that you live there all the time because it is an average and sometimes you are <sup>a bit</sup> above it and sometimes lower <sup>again</sup> also during the day you find that <sup>at times</sup> you are in a different kind of a state and sometimes you allow certain superficialities simply to pass because they don't amount to very much and you have no intention or no desire at all to introduce some other kind of an element. And at other times it is absolutely necessary to be a little bit more conversant with that what may be considered your inner existence in order perhaps to some extent - derive from it a certain form of solidity for yourself so that you are not so easily swayed by the affairs of ordinary existence and it is really about that that we talk about - ~~that~~ that what ever questions there may be - that occur to us or that you would like to talk about - they always have to be lit up or projected against a certain screen in which then there is a perspective so that it is not only surface matter but perspective that is the quality of insight <sup>of</sup> that what really is making it, you might say more solid because a perspective is another kind of a dimension. This ~~depends on that wish is another kind of a dimension.~~ <sup>That</sup> This depends on that wish for more solidity, <sup>&</sup> I'm willing to go a little bit further or deeper than I usually would allow myself to go. So the quality of questions that you do have and the subjects that really you would like to discuss always have to be colored as I say with that in mind. They

should belong to superficial - but nevertheless - they should belong to  
 your daily <sup>not be</sup> life, <sup>your daily</sup> otherwise it has not much meaning. If it is only theory -  
 it's very nice to sit and think about it when you're by yourself or even  
 when you want to have a little talk about it or sometimes when you want  
 to have a little talk about it or sometimes when you want to read a book<sup>k</sup>  
 but we are really trying to become a little more practical to talk about  
 the things to some extent even that might bother you or where a little  
 more elucidation <sup>may</sup> be quite desirable. Now if <sup>we</sup> you can reach that kind  
 of a level of exchange ~~of~~ <sup>I think there is value in having discussions</sup>  
 of an obligation - when you want to come here on Wednesday - that the calib  
 of such questions have to be in accordance with what I just now explained.  
 That of course you might say I'm prejudice - that is naturally that I  
 believe that in order to get the full benefit of when a question belongs  
 or that with a question <sup>if</sup> it has to be changed over into the actuality  
 of using the material which is represented by the questioner and by the  
 answer - that that of course has to be possible for that question and  
 the material to be put in practice in daily life - otherwise it remains  
 theory and something that you can feel very well about - but it doesn't  
 help you enough. So the practicality really the form of pragmatism that  
 we're interested in has to be based on something <sup>ones</sup> that is common ground  
<sup>something we will not understand with strokes on the ground</sup>  
 and not some where in the blue sky where the mind would like to dwell a  
 little bit in order to get away from the troubles of earth. It's exactly  
 the kind of troubles or problems or <sup>c</sup> conditions under which we live - what  
 to do with this or that or how and what is the proper attitude I should  
 take or these <sup>that</sup> or that conditions life has forced on me - how will I  
 meet it. And ~~if~~ of course in an answer of that kind ~~that~~ <sup>if</sup> I say I'm a  
 little prejudiced because for me the solution is always that it can be  
 explained and understood and also that it can be made helpful if one in-  
 troduces an element which is not necessarily of the earth and simply I  
 call it objectivity and then naturally we go over into that what we call

I say I  
 have a  
 little  
 bit

Work or ideas à la Gurdjieff or the ideas of consciousness or the introduction sometimes of conscience and maybe ultimately leading to a form of will of man if he is able really to act in the right way and know that that what is his activity is reaching a certain purpose and fulfilling that kind of an aim in the way it ought to be attended to. So leaving alone this particular prejudice - I think it is important to keep it in mind that whenever there are questions - there ought to be an answer that gets hold of you in some way or other and that if the answer is not right in the sense that it does not satisfy <sup>your</sup> question or that it doesn't help you - you have to insist that you continue to ask - <sup>so</sup> that either it becomes clear and <sup>that it is useful or that you come to the realization</sup> it is not for you because it is obvious of course that any ideas of this kind are to some extent <sup>you might say</sup> narrow minded. I mean by that, they are restricted. They are only for certain people who are willing to do some Work for themselves in order to accumulate data - further data about themselves and also to acquire a certain dexterity of what to do under certain conditions and in what light then one has to look at <sup>that</sup> whatever one has experienced. So with that in mind and perhaps we haven't met for two or three weeks - with the vacation - with all the New Year's resolutions - with Christmas and the meaning of Christmas - and a New year ahead of you and cleaning old ships with new brooms or whatever you're using in order to cleanse your life or to get to a certain accounting with yourself and to see what actually there are as principles in your life ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ <sup>guide you or that can</sup> that can to a certain extent help you - ~~xxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ that you really want to use or perhaps even embellish or maybe sharpen as you sharpen a tool. That with that kind of a thing going now into a new year <sup>(suspects?)</sup> - you may have some new ideas or new prospects or new approaches or different things that have come to your notice which we talk about. So what kind of questions do you have in your mind?

Q: I'd like one thing elucidated please. I've just started my own readings and I noticed that Fritz Peters claims that Gurdjieff



Q.:

said that women cannot self develop within his <sup>type</sup> kind of system. If that is so - is it pointless then for we females to be here.

M.N.: Yes, it would be quite pointless if I would believe Fritz Peters. I ~~was~~ think in the first place Gurdjieff so called told him. In the second place - Fritz Peters is telling us and naturally I prefer <sup>the right</sup> to believe it or not. If you want to know my opinion, I don't think Gurdjieff said it. I think if he said something, Fritz Peters misunderstand it and Fritz Peters being the kind of a man he is or woman he is did not not know how to take it. If you know what I mean. So for the time being, let's consider it <sup>s</sup> ~~und~~aid and I will <sup>simply</sup> try to live in accordance with what you don't think you are able to do. Thank God - we ~~what~~ know what might happen. If I could look in the future - I probably would be completely at a loss at times if I ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ knew ahead of time that such and such and such a thing is possible and another thing is impossible. And particularly when it is impossible and I would like it-but then I would have to give up and then that desire of my life surely would ~~have~~ be completely lost to me and I would feel not only at a loss - I would be quite ready to end my life. You know ~~at~~ whenever any one in a very general way says about a certain class of people in which there are about fifty percent on this earth - that consciousness is not <sup>a</sup> possible for them - then I think it is idiotic to talk about consciousness in general. It never says that this kind of Work is for man only - unless by man is used the genetic term - of a full grown person and that includes man and woman. Regarding consciousness <sup>& regarding the possibility of self-consciousness</sup> the distinction between man and woman really doesn't amount to very much. We make a great deal of it on earth because naturally we consider it two different species or two different kinds <sup>of people</sup> which of course more or less belong together or could belong together and ~~they~~ have different attributes and different ways of functioning. But all of that what is the difference between a man and a woman - falls away when I start to measure

with a different kind of a measure. When with consciousness I measure the quality of a man, I'm not interested in his manifestations. I'm interested ~~in~~ what he is inherently and with his inner life. And then the question remains - this difference between the inner life of a man or a woman so different. Of course it isn't - the differences <sup>that</sup> I know are differences of outside functions. The motivations come from a certain central point or if it isn't central it is surely more essential. And if it then is expressed the closer I get - to the centralism of such points the less there is a possibility of a distinction. I mean by that that there is very little difference when I become essentially a man - because I act then very much like other men because all of us if one takes simply even the body totally - have definite appetites <sup>for</sup> definite organs functioning in a certain way in which all men are equal dependent entirely on the conditions where they may have been brought up and what their education <sup>there</sup> is and the <sup>acquired</sup> characteristics of them and <sup>even</sup> ~~even~~ the different places on earth where they happen to live. Of course it will give them different aspects and different aspirations but essentially men are very much alike. As I say - that what I would call essential that what for me is on a level which is not the manifestation as I know it - but has much more to do with the quality of breathing and if I would say there is such a difference between the breath of a woman or the breath of a man, I'm afraid that I would have a hard time trying to prove it. You see the realm of consciousness is dependent in the first place on where we start which is the level of emotions and in the second place it is a question of what is the kind of food that is necessary to reach a higher level of consciousness. And if I understand that that what is used as material for that in the form of ordinary impressions - that the impressions already being further removed from the level of breathing have in themselves - perhaps as abstract forms or when they are crystalized as complete forms in my mind a certain idea

that they as such are the same regardless of what a man or a woman happens to think. That moreover- the quality that will make them food for the fulfillment of something that I would like to grow or have grow in me in order to reach a state of consciousness - when it becomes so called active - or when it becomes conscious or when the impressions are received by a human being in a conscious state - all of that is kind of material that has nothing to do anymore with a man or a woman. Originally there is a little different kind of a quality perhaps between the mind of a man and the mind of a woman and perhaps between the heart or the solar plexis of a woman and the solar plexis or the heart of a man. And I can say the difference is a little gradual. One has a little bit more if I want to use that kind of a distinction, a little more intellect or one says a man in general is a little bit more intellectually inclined and the woman is a little less and on the other hand, to compensate for ~~that~~ it - that a woman has a little bit more intuition and lives a little bit more by her feelings than sometimes a man cannot cope with- but that is only a difference in gradation not in quality. Of course one can philosophize about it and one can talk about what is man - what is woman and not necessarily have to talk about what would be the consciousness of a man or a woman - but you see we're not talking about that now. We're talking about motivations of man and woman regarding the possibility of something that doesn't exist. And what doesn't exist need not necessarily be by extrapolation out of which it came - (then) that if the distinction between man and women would have to continue to exist on a higher level of consciousness - what would happen to the idea even of cosmic consciousness when I still would make separations between positive and negative. You see the whole problem of changing from the state in which I am now in an unconscious state to a state of consciousness means that there is a unity - that is a possibility of



something that doesn't exist. And what doesn't exist need not necessarily  
 be by extrapolation out of which it came -(then) that if the distinction  
 between man and women would have to continue to exist on a higher level  
 of consciousness - what would happen to the idea even of cosmic consciousness- when I still would make separations between positive and negative.  
 You see the whole problem of changing from the state in which I am now  
 in an unconscious state to a state of consciousness means that there is  
 a unity - that is a possibility of becoming one in order with this  
 oneness to enter into another level which is higher. If the oneness  
 is there, there is no distinction any more between positive and negative  
 And the whole theory of Gurdjieff of course is based on positive,  
 negative and neutralizer being fused into one and as one being ready  
 to move to the next level. So the next level - there's no reason anymore  
 to separate them out into the ~~different performing~~ parts of man and  
 woman. It doesn't belong there. That what counts on a higher level is  
 an emotional quality. And that what becomes predominant on the level of  
 self-consciousness is one's emotion - one's emotional life. Now what be-  
 comes predominant on the level of cosmic consciousness if we want to  
 go that far is simply a difference of an intellectual consciousness that  
 there is something that has to be understood and where the unity is  
 possible on an intellectual level. So if I take the three different  
 possibilities of man on earth, man as self-conscious, you might say living  
 on a planetary level, and man as intellectual having a soul body - living  
 on the sphere or on the plane of what for us is now the sun - then simply  
 it means that if there is a difference between them - the accent for unity  
 if that is needed for man and woman is shifted to an emotional plane.  
 And as far as I know there is no difference <sup>between</sup> in the energies as expressed  
 by a woman or a man emotionally speaking. I do not know of any distinction  
 because I think that the quality of a person - says I love you and  
 it is emotional and not sexual - ~~it~~ is simply a statement in which

there is a flow of certain forms of energies which I've never recognized as something - this is a manly feeling and that is a womanly feeling. You understand what I mean. There are three different ways of equilibrium - three different ways of unity - even man with the three centers as he has them at the present time undeveloped as they are can have an inkling of what might be meant by it. So that in an ideal state of relaxation and in a state in which there could be fusion and union { that in the first place { the relationship between man and woman have to be straightened out on an ordinary physical level } that in the second place there should be a unity at least a possibility of unity as far as feeling or emotion is concerned and in the third place { it should be possible to have a certain unity or understanding on the basis of intellect. Very often of course we forget it - because all we many times are considering <sup>if we</sup> that what I so called feel as love and it immediately goes over into sex. And this kind of form of attraction of course belongs to earth and it's quite alright as far as earth is concerned. <sup>& of course we tolerate</sup> ~~Why we~~ not only tolerate } we even appreciate { there is a difference. But if it's emotion - it's a different thing and the differences that exist on a physical plane do not necessarily exist on an emotional one + and the kind of measure that I have to apply emotionally + is quite different from physical and even intellectual. <sup>different from</sup> So that the total picture of man as he now wants to call himself - in love with anyone that may be of the opposite sex is simply based on the possibility of a relationship sexually expressed in the form of unity and the form of understanding. In the second place - on an emotional scale in which it is possible between such a man and woman to understand each other in such a way that no words even are necessary and the realization of a silence of feeling can exist and then produce a unity. As far as the intellect is concerned - it is of course the use

of certain words in order to illustrate or at least to put in words certain concepts that <sup>one</sup> perhaps ~~one~~ feels or <sup>at least</sup> wishes to express - that ~~that~~ in that sense unity is quite possible, whenever I understand the workings of the mind of the other person - and that it is not any longer a question of agreeing completely in the same kind of words with the other person - but that I know what is being meant and then I ~~know~~ appreciate the way that thought has been produced - even if I don't agree with it. Unity can be reached simply by means of the understanding of I know what you mean, although I think differently, nevertheless I love you. You understand what I mean. Let's leave Fritz Peters out. We put him outside the door. I would almost say that's where he belongs.

M.N.: Yes!

Q: Mr. Nyland - I'm confused about the relationship and the development in attempting to attain a will in relationship

M.N.: In attempting to what-

Q: Attain a will - consciousness, objectivity, between directed Work and objectivity - and directed work on a personality. This has come out of experiences I've had at school in seminars in awareness - none of which had a background of Gurdjieff but some of them - when you talk about Gurdjieff exercises - I hear <sup>words</sup> things that correspond to <sup>which</sup> ~~what~~ I did and that seem to describe things that I ~~xx~~ experience sometimes. When you were talking about sensing.

M.N.: Have you heard much of me talking about sensing?

Q: No!

M.N.: How do you know then what I say?

Q: That's what I'm not sure of - you see I'm saying it just sounds that way even though I didn't have the same background.

M.N.: Well it may be quite possible you know- some people have a very good intuition - also in the direction of self-consciousness. And there

are people I think who are perhaps of a rare exception but nevertheless might exist - who already by their fortunate nature may know something about Objectivity. I don't doubt it for a moment that there are similarities ~~about objectivity~~ and different ways of expressing regardless of whatever ~~the~~ source although it may be the same, it may not be the same. That sometimes certain words are used which reverberate in the same way as the words that belong to another kind of <sup>viewpoint</sup> or philosophy or even a dogma. Now to what extent they are actually the same and to what extent really is meant by the use of such words, Whatever the author or the person has in mind <sup>is</sup> wanting to express. I think a little bit more would be necessary in order to see what is really meant by this and that and that kind of a word for instance let's say sensing. So when we talk about 'objectivity' or we talk about 'Work on oneself', or that what may be meant in accordance with what Gurdjieff has said or has explained - that ~~that~~ now is taken by us as a certain form of trying ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> to Work on oneself in a certain way and a very exact way and ~~there in~~ different kind of religions or in different people who express themselves in a certain way and then show a certain similarity - the similarity may be only regarding that one word and it may not be regarding certain concepts that are related to it. So I would <sup>I would</sup> go very slow in trying to think that ~~that~~ whatever you have experienced - that may have a meaning for you at the present time - that that is the same. At the same time I say it's quite possible it is the same - only you would have to find out and for that you would have to know that what you have experienced and quite well - without any further thought about it at the present time to recognize what it was when you did experience it and what at the present time - your meaning or your understanding is of 'Work on yourself' or the concept of Objectivity. I think it'll take a little while.

Q: My further question in relation to that ~~is one which~~ <sup>was this work which</sup> was directed

many other  
kind of ideas  
come up  
here & there

many M.N.: Let me say one thing. As far as certain Work as expressed by  
 little <sup>bits of</sup> schools or people who think they know or perhaps know a little  
 bit. They know something - I believe that there is of course a great  
 deal of information - that is available and has reached certain channels  
 and then as such can be quite pure. But I think <sup>that</sup> ~~also~~ <sup>also</sup> that certain things  
 are forgotten and many times you now mention about personality and so  
 forth - this whole question of Objectivity can only be understood if  
 one understands what is meant by impartiality and that usually the  
 question of impartiality is completely forgotten. For impartiality it  
 is necessary to develop something that is at the present time not in  
 existence because we are not able to be impartial with our mind or  
 with our feeling and when the requirements for objectivity implies  
 an impartiality - ~~that~~ implies of course at the same time a simul-  
 taneity - an instantaneousness - an understanding or a real experience  
 of a moment. Then when I start to compare it <sup>with</sup> different forms of  
 religions that I know about or that I've read about or heard or heard  
 other people speak ~~xxxxxx~~ then I say yes <sup>take</sup> for instance ~~take~~ the  
 question of the moment <sup>take</sup> a Zen, but can I with the mind the way it  
 is <sup>understands</sup> what is meant as a concept and then experience it as  
 a moment. It's very questionable - although I may admit that the word  
 moment is being used. Impartiality is very seldom used - in the sense  
<sup>at least</sup> that Gurdjieff means it. It would mean an elimination totally of all  
 emotional involvements and many people who shy away from it because  
 if they say - ah - I cannot feel about it, It becomes much too cold  
<sup>for me</sup> or too intellectual and therefore it is not for me. Anyone who wants  
 to express anything <sup>all the time</sup> will want to use his feelings to  
 express ~~anything - all the time~~ will want to use his feelings to ~~express~~  
 it in order to bring home a certain point or partly to express to the  
 other that that what they are saying is serious and earnest and there  
<sup>purely</sup> ~~purely~~ <sup>just taking</sup> even intellectualists who are satisfied by just ~~taking~~



*stating*

certain things without any further embellishment. One can always start to judge about what is really the validity of any kind of a doctrine - if it has this particular kind of requirement - which I say is an Impartiality - because if they don't use it and if they continue with thinking and feeling even if to the highest degree of possibilities developed - they will never reach a state of Objectivity when by that is meant anything existing which is non-subjective and as long as feeling and mind as we know it which of course are subjective in any human being still remains and when it is even in improvement still retains the character of subjectivity. It will never go over into an objective <sup>feeling</sup> ~~pattern~~. And <sup>its</sup> ~~there's~~ only the introduction of an impartiality which eliminates at that time all kind of feelings that will enable a feeling center really to become aware of its proper function of feeling only without any further affects or influence either from the mind or from the body. But you see we would have to go a little ~~bit~~ further in detail about it to explain it and this is, you might say, the touch stone. This is the way by which you can recognize a certain doctrine to have value or not because if nothing is said about impartiality - it will never reach God.

Q : Does that mean <sup>then</sup> that there is little value in working to ~~dis-~~  
tinquish the....

M.N.: Not at all - there is a great deal of ~~value~~ <sup>that,</sup> in- only it has to come at the proper time.

Q : I meant just <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ personality without trying to do...

M.N.: Whatever you want to do with your ~~personality~~ <sup>or</sup> in order to study it and in order to rake up all the different things that you have - 'a-la psychoanalysis- of what has been taking place and what made you at the present time <sup>fect</sup> ~~and~~ what you are now and so far and ~~a~~ <sup>as a person, or a</sup> ~~per~~ <sup>fect</sup> description of what you are ~~as a~~ <sup>as a</sup> psychic-person or whatever, ~~and~~ it maybe, ~~psychio-~~ logically developed in a certain way - by analysis - by psychotherapy

whatever shock treatment you may have had. All of that has a certain  
~~immense~~ value to bring a person to the realization of what he is at the  
 present time but still it can never be the absolute truth because it  
 is always going to be colored with their interpretation either with  
 their mind or their feeling and everything that I now try to think or  
 to feel about my personality and trying to be objective to it - I never  
 can be objective because the things that I have to become objective to  
 sometimes I don't like and <sup>then</sup> I will cover them up or I will explain it in  
 a certain way that I can live with. <sup>See,</sup> I think that is the greatest  
 difficulty - that all the things can be useful exactly as information <sup>the same</sup>  
 astrologically about me as a type or whatever my horoscope says - that  
 I am supposed to do and so forth - it's perfectly correct from the  
 standpoint of earth. But as soon as it starts to indicate that I have <sup>now</sup>  
 to behave in accordance with being an Aries or a Scorpio and therefore  
 I am now bound to be that forever and ever and hereafter maybe then I  
 think astrologically it is a very bad influence. You see the same way  
 if  
 psychoanalysis is also bad because ~~there~~ <sup>if</sup> there is a mother-complex, that  
 I have, I will ~~always~~ <sup>always</sup> ~~try~~ <sup>try</sup> to find out if my mother-complex is around <sup>always</sup>  
 the next corner and I will start to interpret every kind of an action  
 in accordance with the literature of Freud or someone <sup>body</sup>. And it's quite  
 non-sensical. I've mentioned once in awhile when I happened to be in  
 the tropics and looking at the sunset from a boat and the sun was set-  
 ting down and it was beautiful - like tropical sunsets can be with the  
 coloring of the sky and the deep blue and the deep reds and the passen-  
 ger who was with me <sup>7</sup> stood there also in contemplation and said, you  
 know - he <sup>said</sup> ~~said~~ that's all sex. So of course I was surprised, <sup>because</sup> I never  
 thought of the sun as being full of sex or not sex or whatever it was.  
 For me it was just a beautiful (sight) and I was ecstatically so emo-  
 tionally involved in it but surely not in that way. So, you, <sup>see</sup> these kind

of things one enters when one has a word and it seems to fit certain occasions you will start to apply <sup>in</sup> + practically everything & then everything comes under that kind of a coloration - before you know it you're way out. It does not mean that whatever one has as education - whatever one has acquired - all the different things that one has experienced and particularly those for which one has suffered and <sup>then</sup> ~~had~~ acquired because of that suffering and then maybe has established certain principles within one or perhaps has formed ones character, That that of course becomes extremely useful at the proper time when I know how to use it. But that for the time being if I try to acquire a new form of technique - I must really forget that I have all kinds of other things. You know if I want to play piano in accordance with a certain system and I play let's say a little exercise of Schmidt, and one of those you know ( da-da-de-da-da-da-da) whatever it may be - that then I never will be able to get away by playing something that doesn't require an exercise at all and I run the risk that when I want to play Chopin, I will play it a-la Mr. Schmidt. You see this is the difficulty. Whenever I have a technique, I want to form my ability in accordance with that technique and I exclude then at least for a little while all kind of other techniques in order not to be disturbed. That when I once know it ~~that~~ <sup>when</sup> I will go out and find out what someone else has said and I will be able to pick and chose because I know what I wish. Leave whatever it is as far as your ~~past~~ and ~~your~~ experience and that what <sup>you have had</sup> ~~it is~~ - leave it alone for a little while. But be very happy that one has at the present time a desire to find out what is meant by objectivity. And that even if it strikes a corresponding note and you say isn't that interesting - but don't be deviated from the idea that you still have to learn it. As soon as you go over into something (where) you say - oh - yes - I know it already - you're spoiled

*10 persons.*

and it is not so difficult to spoil ~~it~~. Little children who have to write an essay on Egypt and the pyramids when they are about 15 or 16 years old, never will open a book on Egypt anymore and when they see a pyramid they say - oh yes, I know all about it (*Ramesses*) the second II he lived in so and so - finished as far as Egyptian culture is concerned. As soon as I know a little bit and I'm satisfied because I live that kind of a superficial life - naturally why should I bother hearing the same thing ~~again and again~~ *again & again* when I already know it and it is very difficult to divorce oneself from the old ideas of leaving them alone for a little while. For instance you want to play piano or *play* music and you have been brought up quite musically and you know all about Mozart and the different sonatas of Beethoven and there are certain melodies in it that *play* stay with you or *play* you with them and they're in your mind and so you sit in front of the piano and you try to play something of your own. As soon as you allow it - that what is already *a* melody perhaps a technique in your fingers, *appears* ~~is~~ and it goes then in the same direction as Mozart, trying to form this or that or the other and very soon you don't know anymore if it *is* ~~is~~ you or if it is Mozart or it is a reinterpretation of Mozart by you but it's quite certain that it is not your own and the difficulty is that if one wants to remain original for one's own development - you can be affected and ~~of~~ influenced by others *but* and it still has to go through you as if you have eaten and digested it and that then as a result of that digestion that you have certain food that is now useful for you to build up something that is entirely your own. We're talking about the possibility of a development in man of something that becomes his own - for which he doesn't have to say thank you to mother-nature. You see we talk about the possibility of the development of an emotional body which at the present time exists only half and for the possibility of development or at least the starting of the growing of something we might call soul as an intellectual possibility

*So this is like a but*

for man which ~~is~~ at the present time doesn't exist at all - than only in ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> one fundamental note of 'do'. So there's a question how I want to build this. I want to build ~~this~~ <sup>it</sup> with material that is my own and has become my property and I will only make it my own property ~~not~~ <sup>when I</sup> because it is acquired, ~~not~~ <sup>because</sup> because someone else has told me - or because it ~~is~~ happens to be in <sup>accordance with the</sup> conditions of earth - but that I have worked for it in a certain way - to give it a quality of objectivity because that is the material <sup>out of</sup> with which I want to build something that could become and remain objective. So it is all the time the ~~right~~ <sup>for</sup> to find something that is really my own ~~for~~ <sup>the</sup> which I have worked and I've worked against ~~different~~ <sup>different</sup> difficulties that have been put in my way by mother-nature who will tell me to stay asleep and not to bother too much. That for that reason I have to be careful ~~because~~ to excluded already things that I have acquired in a certain way and then start to compare them and pretty soon I'll say - ~~as~~ <sup>well</sup>, that's exactly the same as before and when I say that, I know really that I don't know what I'm talking about. That's why I say - leave it alone for a little while - then come back to it. From the standpoint of objectivity, ~~for~~ <sup>or</sup> for something that gives you more light and more insight, ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> is much nicer to look at something that already has been past and then put it ~~and~~ <sup>or</sup> focus it with a different kind of light on it, to see if it still has the same kind of quality and you have to be ready <sup>I think</sup> in many ways to give up many things that now are very precious and dear to you but under the light of Objectivity have absolutely no reason for existence. Don't let it discourage you. It'll come up anyhow, You can't help it. You will keep on comparing ~~you can't help it~~ <sup>you can't</sup> - you say isn't that interesting - that I already knew when I was ten years old - O.K. Leave it alone. Keep on working - Keep on trying to apply ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> simple rules of the A,B,C's of observation of that what, is, impartiality, and simultaneity - of perhaps what could become participation, <sup>what</sup> what could



become an experimental application of certain ideas, whatever it may be that is involved in Work on oneself - keep on - keep on - keep on as much as you can to acquire data that are more valuable because they are more absolute because they are less and less affected by personal interpretations - less and less affected by what you feel or what you think - or what it ought to be in accordance with the ordinary rules of ordinary morality - that gradually the value of Objective value - starts <sup>because</sup> to become apparent ~~and when~~ there's no further arguments about it. That's the characteristic of Objectivity. It is ~~univ-~~ersally accepted. Alright - you're not discouraged?

Q: A little

M.N.: I hope you're not.

.....

Q: One of the talks I listened to recently - you were talking about objectivity and you said objectivity is the freedom which I <sup>subscribe</sup> ~~described~~ to <sup>but</sup> ~~you~~ when I fall down the stairs ~~when~~ I tried to put it into operation.

M.N.: What?

Q: Could you give some illustrations of how to be objective in a specific situation?

M.N.: As soon as you notice a certain fact existing outside of you or a fact existing of yourself - which comes to your notice and about which you have no desire to change it one way or the other - that you could accept it ~~for~~ whatever it is without even having any wish to put a name to it or to classify it in some way or other. Then you are objective regarding that kind of a fact. You know very ~~xxxxxx~~ well what it is to be Objective regarding outside people or outside conditions. Whenever you have to make up your mind about certain things that have to be done and you can go left or right and in order to try to become objective ~~if~~ you weigh everything that is involved and finally you come to a conclusion. You say I tried to be

as Objective as I can and then I made up my mind. If you sometimes want to tell someone - for their own good and it may hurt a little bit - you say - now mind you I do this in an objective sense. It's for you. It's not for me. The emphasis then is not on what you wish but that what you realize is really truthful for the other. So this is the question about objectivity regarding oneself, that I can accept the condition in which I am that is the way I behave, whatever it is that I manifest as a result of what ever I feel and think - that that I will accept for whatever it is - as it is - to the extent that I exclude any wish on my own part that in that kind of an image which I receive by observing - I do not introduce any wish to change it. So you see - I'm not comparing it with how it should be or that it is not right or that it is not A-la bon ton, or that it should really be that different or that I could do better but I haven't and it is because it's raining that I'm doing this and so forth and all these kind of explanations. As soon as I consider the behavior of myself when I feel a little awkward because so and so is looking at me and I know the opinion that so and so has of me is not enhanced because I was behaving like a little nincompoop. It's quite possible at such a time impossible for me to be objective. Naturally I feel sorry. I would like to have ~~it~~ changed. I would like to have things undone. I may have said things for which I was not responsible and maybe I have to excuse myself or at least apologize or whatever it maybe. Everything that I do I do with a little bit of a thought or a feeling about my behavior more or less criticizing it - or more or less liking it - whatever it may be - but very seldom that I can be objective about myself. And I say this is the difficulty - that I cannot be objective - because the apparatus with which I measured it cannot be objective. A feeling is always something that is a feeling about something that

I have had which I feel about a little later. And the same is true of thoughts - because the thought process always is that what is anticipatory - that what is coming from the fusion - that what is already ~~x~~ past and has become memory - and it is never a realization of the existence of a moment - because a moment goes by too fast. My mind is incapable of having a receptive organ for the reception or the perception of a moment and all I can do is to understand the question <sup>(link)</sup> ~~of~~ time within me, if I connect it up with that what is going to come and that what has already gone. As far as my feeling is concerned, I think immediately whenever I discover any form of my behavior in any way whatsoever - it reminds me of a certain condition which I am critical about since it has to do with me and <sup>that</sup> very seldom that I can look at myself and say everything is good because <sup>but</sup> there's always something that I want to change or sometimes that I indulge in - I say I like <sup>it</sup>. The <sup>this question</sup> ~~description~~ of self-love and vanity - the question of criticalness the question of not being satisfied with the way one is - all the time considering oneself - that one can do better - or that perhaps appreciation that other people give to me is not exactly the way I would like it - that I feel that I'm worth more than I am - and all the different things that we call human virtues or human vices. All of that I'm subject to - Objectivity in the sense that we know it on earth <sup>when</sup> as an example for instance a judge having to judge <sup>objectively</sup> knows both sides and he is sympathetic - so he has to exclude a little bit of his feeling - as far as a scientist is concerned - trying to look at an objective fact - it's extremely difficult for a scientist to remain honest - particularly when something of his own reputation is <sup>I've given the example many times</sup> ~~involved~~. There are very few things that I'm interested in because <sup>you know</sup> I've made a certain new substance by putting a little molecule and another together and so forth and now according to my theory - it has to have a melting point at ~~a~~ certain degree and I say it's 185- that

with it  
rather  
very difficult  
to do

about  
certain

has to be the melting point according to my theory - and my theory of course is my own - and I'm very much attached to it and therefore - now I'm going to test it and here is a little bit of the substance and I put it in a test tube and I raise the temperature and by golly it starts to melt already at 179. Well you see I'm a good scientist now - and what will I do - here I'm in a conflict because my pet theories of course are no good ~~&~~ particularly when I've <sup>now</sup> already published so that people already attach a name to my - and say ah - this man - he knows and now it proves that the practical fact ~~&~~ which I now objectively must register as a fact because it is something that not only I can experience but any other scientist doing it in the same way - under the same kind of conditions will find that that substance is melting at 179 and so my pride and everything that I've built up - how difficult is it for me as a scientist to say I ~~was~~ made a mistake?

You see Objectivity does require that. How often a person uses some words or a phrase particularly a politician not only that they promise the impossible but ~~they~~ make certain statements that are a little bit you know - never mind how someone else can imply this or that ~~&~~ they're not exactly correct but at least - so after a little while they're caught and they're called on (<sup>the carper</sup> ~~the carper~~) to explain it and then they go through all kind of difficulties <sup>of</sup> explaining how they really meant it - they said it but they really didn't ~~want~~ want to say it that way - but when they said it - they had something else in mind <sup>etc. etc.</sup> you know this kind of hypocrisy ~~&~~ this kind of question <sup>of course it's a</sup> ~~that~~ every-body knows because we do it all the time. I'm all the time interested in creating a little better impression than I am - and if I could derive from that admiration from someone else - of course it tickles me. And I know sometimes it is not true - but the other person believes for instance I have done some extremely interesting work of a secretive nature ~~&~~ working for the government ~~&~~ and I have of course -

have had inside <sup>had at that time</sup> possibility of looking at all <sup>kind of</sup> secret documents  
 this and that and so forth you know and then your son hears about how  
 his father was such and such and he looks <sup>at you with</sup> into his admiring eyes and  
 says - but how wonderful - you know one lets it go even if maybe once  
 upon the time in your life you've seen one secret confidential document  
 But you see the admiration particularly from a son - and one has and  
 of course it is noticeable and you know it and then you say but I  
 don't want to tell him because it would disturb him - in reality -  
 one bakes in ones own glory. It's extremely difficult to be honest  
 with oneself and particularly when other people are involved and that  
 why one says sometimes when I'm all by myself - in that what is the  
 inner inner chamber - as if at a certain time I'm in the presence of  
 God and with God of course I cannot lie - because He knows and He  
 would know if I would lie. Therefore I cannot tell a lie in the pre-  
 sence of him. That even then I will explain to Him - that that what  
 I said was really not a lie. You understand - it is human nature. But  
 these are examples of how to try to become objective. So now apply  
 this <sup>simply</sup> ~~in~~ simple possibilities of <sup>certain, lets say</sup> simple forms of exercises. I want  
 to be aware + aware I call a moment of objectivity of realization  
 for myself - in the ~~particular~~ acceptance of certain facts as they are -  
 particularly <sup>when they return to</sup> manifestations of myself - in the form of my behavior -  
 whatever it may be and whatever may have caused it - no further inter-  
 est in whatever the source was - simply stating a fact of how I am and  
 how I am physically - behaving in a certain way and ~~that~~ then my mind  
 starts to register that as a fact of existence without any wish of  
 changing at all - without having any particular opinion or a like or  
 dislike - so <sup>this is</sup> ~~these are~~ the requirements of how to reach at least a  
 little bit of a taste of objectivity about oneself and I chose for  
 that now a form of behavior to which I'm not primarily involved not



even feelingly or emotionally - about which I really don't care <sup>where I</sup>  
 sometimes in a movement of myself which is already habitual - <sup>where I</sup> ~~which~~  
<sup>have</sup> I excluded my intellect so that the body itself can take care of it-  
 if I select that and now you might say bring it out in the open as  
 if it comes to a certain form of consciousness - It is of a knowledge <sup>when</sup>  
 that my body is existing and that it walks and that I would like to  
 register the fact of it, my body, walking without any further descrip-  
 tion or without any liking and that as I say it is just habitually <sup>is</sup>  
 walking. There is nothing involved. It doesn't mean that I'm so  
 beautiful when I walk - <sup>or that I'm not myself when I walk -></sup> and it my body walks, and my mind in a cer-  
 tain section of it tries to become objective to that fact and tries  
 to register. So I say- here I am- here it walks- here my "I" observes  
 "it" my body walking. I say it's the beginning maybe of my "I-" of that  
 what is now registering a fact for whatever it is whatever is the  
 objective value of that fact- without interpretations- pure fact or  
 pure intellect, pure recording- pure rates of vibrations in my mind-  
 as a recording machine- exactly the same as a lens records exactly  
 what's in front of it <sup>or</sup> like a recorder records exactly what is <sup>the</sup> re-  
<sup>voice &</sup> corded at the moment when it happens, then it is there and nothing  
 in the whole world can change it afterwards. You see this is the  
 question of absoluteness- that nothing can be tampered with anymore  
 and it comes out <sup>to</sup> then in the open as it were because it has become  
 past- since it is a fact that has now disappeared as such. It <sup>is</sup>  
 no longer attached to a particular moment- so whatever is past is  
 finished and it is <sup>then</sup> as a fact recorded in my brain <sup>as</sup> objectively  
 as I can make it. It is of course - it's extremely difficult <sup>to apply</sup> of course  
 there is no doubt. because it goes contrary to everything that I'm use  
 to and surely it is objectionable from the standpoint of mother-nature  
 because mother-nature doesn't want me to Wake-Up. So if I'm intereste  
 in trying to develop something that is not of this earth - in the fin

place I have to be in a good state - in the second place I have to be ready to fight. I have to wrestle with that what is my ordinary condition- the way it is and always has been brought up and all the different tendencies and characteristics- they are for me at that time of no use and nevertheless I'm stupid enough to believe that it is possible to develop ~~it~~ simply because I happen to have a thought of the possibility - this is the interesting thing of the mind- that at times it has a possibility of believing in something that might exist which at the present time does not exist. You might say this is the one life-giving force of the mind in which it is not taking everything for whatever it sees and whatever it can perceive by all kind of sense organs but that there is also something that hopes for something that might exist now <sup>potentially</sup> and could grow out into an actuality. I say this is the saving grace. Perhaps that is ~~the~~ to some extent God shaking you a little bit or placing every once in a while an alarm clock near you <sup>when you then here whatever which you</sup> then a t such a moment receives an impression of- it might be possible. The impossible might be possible for me. It is very much of that same kind of caliber- the difficulty of introduction of anything objective into a subjective world because everything subjective as it is around is of course from the standpoint of development- an enemy for the possible developing anything objective. You know the earth does not require objectivity. Earth requires sleep; Man simply fulfilling his functions with his eyes closed because he's here simply for the purpose of maintaining earth and taking in food and converting it and simply in that particular process- he remains on earth when he dies- he has a body- it deteriorates and furnishes material again for whatever is needed for the maintenance of earth and sometimes we <sup>say</sup> way for the maintenance of the moon. But whatever it is- he happens to be <sup>here</sup> there and he happens to die. We're talking about that what

perhaps is a ~~memnant~~ of God within man and that is not so easily you might say killed or it is not so easily fooled because it still believes in the possibility of freedom. Make your own ideas about objectivity. Try to apply it and see what is objective <sup>that</sup> or you could be objective to. As soon as you have that kind of an experience and you do it again and again - you will see that there are differences of course and that something is a little bit more objective than ~~the~~ other- and then later you have something and you say, no that was no good because I remember- I had a moment, ~~a moment~~ of objectivity which was really outstanding. In that way one acquires a certain quantity of material which you might say- I classify it- 5% objective, 10%, 99%- leaving 100 percent for the gods <sup>only</sup>

M.N.: Yeh?

... Q: A couple of months you mentioned something about prayer. How does one go about preparing oneself for prayer and praying?

M.N.: What kind of upbringing have you had?

~~Q:~~

MnN.: That is, conditioning as far as prayer? <sup>is concerned?</sup>

Q: Not very much.

M.N.: How <sup>d</sup> do you think about prayer then? <sup>now</sup>

Q: Well, <sup>an</sup> the closest thing that has touched me is something you said about preparing a room <sup>an</sup>, so that God might come into it.

M.N.: Does that appeal to you?

Q: Yes

M.N.: Prayer of course has to be in order to establish a relationship with a higher form of being or a power which may be helpful to you- so the prayer has to be in line with what one knows for oneself <sup>that</sup> that is right and also that one is entitled to ask it from a higher power if that higher power actually can exist for one- that then in that kind of a relationship you ~~hope~~ <sup>that</sup> the higher power will smile on you and

listen to your prayer. So in the first place- it has to be reasonable.

It has to be within the means and the possibility <sup>of whatever it is that</sup> that you ~~are~~ and that

could grow out of what you are now. In the second place it has to be

serious. It cannot be- if it is a higher power of being- certainly

he cannot be bothered by the little things that are a little trouble-  
some to you. So it has nothing to do with your state of health or your-

~~the~~ the weather conditions or whatever or someone who stepped on your

toes and so forth. Those are ordinary mundane things that God of

course cannot be interested in, moreover I would <sup>not</sup> waste His time. IN

the third place, you have to be sure that God is willing to look at

you. And that is a very difficult question because how do I, being

what I am, appear to something that is higher- and wherever I now place

this kind of a God <sup>to whom</sup> I want to <sup>pray</sup> place. perhaps it is a God who is  
on the next level and then perhaps it's a little easier because he

hasn't forgotten as yet how it used to be when he was on that ~~level~~

But if I consider God as eternity or God as endlessness or God as

absolute, I place certain attributes in that kind of <sup>a</sup> not person- that

kind of an entity, that kind of a being, in some ways which are com-  
pletely unknown to me than only by means of a few words which I hope

convey a certain content which at good times when I really can think

and when I honestly can feel that then I believe to have that kind of

a quality that might belong to God. You see the question- now - if I

want to bother or rather if I want to establish that kind of a rela-

tionship hoping then that something can happen to me as a result of

the influence of that what I call God on me and that he deems it ne-

cessary or <sup>deems</sup> ~~(for him)~~ it is necessary to really take cognizance of me

and my existence to some extent you might say I have to be a little

bit conceited. Why should God bother about me when there are thousands

of others that he can bother about and particularly when the Bible says

it is not only mankind but all the swallows and the birds and so forth and nothing will fall down on the earth without His will. You see, such concepts- that is why I ask what kind of an upbringing you have. In how far is the idea of God something that is real or to what extent is it based on certain concepts that have been given to you at the time, either by reading or by some kind of an education. If one wants to bring it very close home and not to go too far as far as God is concerned, I would like to have something that is just a little higher than I am and I would like to interpret that in such a way that it is close enough <sup>to me</sup> to describe it and then to say it is possible for me to change over into that higher form- a little higher- more pure, more real and that what I now consider- good qualifications not only for a human being but more and more in accordance with that what you might say is not earthly and I pray in order to reach that or to become under the influence so that that influence is going to change me into a different kind of a person- so the real prayer has to do with the possibility of an application of that what I know to go in the direction <sup>where</sup> that I wish to go and I say I want to go to God but it is my God and it is a concept <sup>that</sup> I have made and for me is of course sacred and holy. So this is what I meant by being serious when I wish to pray, something in me has to be adjusted and everything of me that is out of joint should not be there. <sup>for</sup> With other words then, when I wish to pray- the totality of my ~~personality~~ <sup>self, all of me, all my functions, all the different organs,</sup> whatever it may be, has to be united in this one wish that that what I now ask for- could be of use to me the way I am. You see if I put it on that basis <sup>then</sup> I have to leave out the possibility that I know it, what is good for me. Because I don't, I only assume and I can ask for that what I think is right so that each prayer has to end with - but not my will. And again I leave it then to what may be of a higher level of being or a power which might influence me- I leave

the totality  
of my  
personality



is right or not. So this kind of  
tion of nothingness- this kind of unwor-  
ing to negate oneself in the presence of that what I'm not now. All of  
that has to be in a real prayer- the totality of myself- that what  
other feelings- you might say- concentrating by means of ones mind-  
being emptied of all kinds of things that might interfere- of a feel-  
ing center or a heart which has only one wish- to be united with God.  
A posture in which one uses ones body in order to express the rever-  
ence to that what is higher than oneself. You might say in that kind  
of a form of prayer- ~~Sometimes~~ <sup>Sometimes</sup> on ones knees- ~~Sometimes~~ <sup>Sometimes</sup> with arms outstretched- ~~Sometimes~~ <sup>Sometimes</sup> looking up in the sky to indicate that is the  
direction which ever way it is and which ever is customary as far as  
prayer is concerned but in any event- the three centers have to become  
one in order to indicate by that kind of a fusion in oneself as become  
that what one wishes to become as a representation of God who is one  
and is the only one unit being. You see there are many qualifications  
for a prayer and for that reason there are many preparations necessary  
before one should pray. Praying is not an easy matter. It is something  
that has to be considered time and time again with a great  
deal of anxiety and a great deal of feeling because you see if one  
prays- if one prays once and it isn't right- the second time  
going to be extremely difficult. Either one prays for  
correctly in which ever way one knows and can und-  
whatever direction it has to go. And in any  
s now completely immersed in this one  
\* I say and it is not that the

a higher kind of a nature do know and does know for me what is right for me. Such a prayer of the unity of everything in oneself as the three centers of man- that is the kind of prayer that will be heard and in all probability will give an understanding in a certain way without defining for oneself that it has to be that what I pray for but that it will <sup>give</sup> me an insight of that what I pray for that it is right or wrong. In other words, I pray for wisdom to know. Alright.

M.N.: ~~Yes~~ Yes.

Q: I have a question that relates to something I'd read in Beelzebub which I hope is proper for this meeting. Ah- there was a (point) in the ~~story~~ book where Gurdjieff discussed a period in the history of Babylon where they had developed art and theatre to a certain degree. He <sup>the</sup> speaks of their development of theatre as the certain group of citizens getting up on stage and acting out as I understood it, situations and events which had occurred to them in their particular lifetime, with a certain amount of significance, meaning and humor and it seemed to me similar to an improvisation-

M.N.: I'm a policeman.

Q: Yes- that's <sup>right</sup>, yes

M.N.: Yah.

Q: Now he started out that particular form of theatre- he felt was pure where as what we now know today <sup>in</sup> and our realm or in the western world of theatre is not pure and I know he sort of said that-what he calls an artist- is he who rightly senses the essence rather than he who is concerned with art...<sup>as</sup> interpretation.

M.N.: Do you understand it?

Q: No- that's why I'm asking the question.

M.N.: <sup>are</sup> ~~Do~~ you ( ) questioning it or just <sup>is it</sup> are you open about it?

Q: I'm open about it. I want to understand.

M.N.: Whenever a person appears to be a policeman and that means that

someone else has to be- maybe a criminal or maybe an innocent bystand-  
 er one creates a certain condition because certain things have been  
 started and other people adapt themselves to the conditions in the way  
 they understand it. In that respect it becomes a form of art because  
 in the first place I have to be flexible. You have to set aside entirely  
 what they are themselves and then they have to act in accordance  
 with the requirements of whatever the conditions would require and  
 simply the fact that someone <sup>says</sup> I'm a policeman- it means that the  
 other person has to become in relation to that policeman - regardless  
 of what he is himself and at that moment- so he has no chance of think-  
 ing about how it ought to be- but there has to be alive in him some -  
 thing that is immediately adaptable and can be useful for the occasion  
 whenever it happens to be. This is a sign of real life in an artist-  
 whenever at any one time- <sup>he</sup> we can express that form of life- in any  
 form as required by the conditions. Well you see that already is absol-  
 utely fundamental and completely different from what we do and already  
 ( <sup>in that respect</sup> ) because I study a role or I imitate what someone else has  
 written up and I become King Lear or whatever it is and then I act in  
 accordance with the rule of Shakespeare or Francis Bacon or whatever it  
 may be. In any event it is not my own. I was simply adapted myself the  
 best <sup>as</sup> that I can after a certain amount of study and then I appear in  
 that kind of a role and of course then functioning in the relationships  
 again <sup>that has been written for me, so that</sup> as established by the play but I want to perform and with that  
 I don't have the play primarily in mind than only as a vehicle- but I  
 wish now approbation from the audience. This is again a fundamental  
 difference. When I'm engaged in something that is required by the condi-  
 tions for me to behave the way it is, I don't think of anyone else  
 judging me. I'm interested in being the part as I have to play as  
 required. But as soon as I wish someone else to like me for it or to  
 admire and <sup>to</sup> clap their hands and so forth- at the end so that I'm a

so in that  
 sense as  
 far as  
 I'm concerned  
 because I  
 now do not  
 think of  
 the play

marvelous actor- then of course I'm looking for somekind of a form of self-satisfaction or vanity which has nothing to do with acting as such. So you see this is the indication- what do I wish regarding this possibility of expressing myself in a certain way and regardless of what I think or feel- regardless of what anyone else might think or feel- but to the extent of ~~what~~ my understanding of what the situation requires. Now this applies of course not only to this being a policeman- *in any kind of a condition in the way* it requires also for anyone man to behave ~~and~~ in accordance with certain rules which are in existence and in which are described the perfect or harmonious behavior of man. You see now we put it on a different kind of a scale- because it becomes just as much an acting in which one wants to adapt oneself and ones life the way it is for the purposes of behaving in a surrounding even on earth in such a way ~~as is~~ *that it is* becoming to man for what a man has to be. If I say ~~not~~ *now* it has to be harmonious- we can quibble about what is meant by that kind of harmony, but in any event it is something which let's say to use that word- a man is in balance and is at any one time able to do what ~~is~~ *over* required by the circumstances *to be done in such a way that it belongs to the fulfillment of* in the way *it* has to be followed up. So it involves the totality of ~~one's~~ *then* ones life in relation to other people- so that the totality of that what is being lived has the characteristic of the continuation of that life for a ~~greater~~ *kind of a* purpose for which they have gotten together. And that therefore the highest form of art for any group of people getting together for whatever purpose *that that purpose* ~~that the members~~ *has* all the time have to have in mind the development of themselves for the sake of the glory of God because the aim of man ~~never~~ *has* can be on the level of being admired by the rest of them. The aim has to be that at the end of ones life- one has reached a little different level- *higher* at least that one has advanced or evolved up to that level- in order to show you might say- that his expenditure ~~as~~ *has* a level- as a level of life ~~as~~ *has* indicated from his birth up to his death- that that kind of a

*he ought to behave*

*such a circumstance*

performance in life- has lead to the possibility as if it could be a stepping stone towards the next level of existence. That I think is inherent in the principle of different lives existing at different levels of the universe. It's the only way by which we can explain it- because we have to take down this whole question of omnipotence and omnipresence into its so called component parts which I can understand <sup>because</sup> but if I say that what is infinity is a combination of all kind of finite levels- it doesn't mean very much unless I ~~can~~ look at the <sup>haven</sup> <sup>so</sup> levels and from one level going up to another- or in <sup>that</sup> finally after <sup>so</sup> say, ~~in so called~~ having reached the highest level- that I then still can include the lowest level because I never would reach unity. If it is a question of reaching God- I have to find in my particular life a possibility of reaching that what is more understanding- and when I am at a higher level- I will have that more understanding because I can then look back- or in retrospect- remember what I have experienced and then have them proper <sup>evaluation</sup> evolution of that what I have experienced as in the past since I'm no longer part of it. So the aim ultimately ~~of~~ man in whatever he does <sup>the</sup> this includes art or philosophy or religion or science- it doesn't matter which- all the time has to be implied- or in that it has to have <sup>the</sup> a coloration of a possibility for the evolution or the evolution of man because if that isn't there- there is no purpose in his life. And if that purpose is taken away man will be floundering on this level or <sup>the</sup> ~~another~~ or a lower without any rhyme or reason. So the aim that a man has <sup>to have</sup> and has to be understood by everyone who lives with him in agreement- understanding that the aim then <sup>is</sup> to go to the totality of understanding which reaches in infinity an experience of unity- that then all acting and everything and every form of art has to have in it <sup>the</sup> that characteristic of ~~the~~ <sup>that</sup> possibility for further growth. This ~~of~~ course is a concept as far as art is concerned which of course we don't have it at all as far as what ~~are~~

our performances are in so called theatre- that sometimes in the writing of a play or sometimes in <sup>the</sup> production of certain piece of art in some form maybe as painting or sculpture or that perhaps in music or sometimes let's say in the digging into <sup>a</sup> certain philosophy <sup>&</sup> trying to find what is the center of things or that in scientific development- one really tries to reach what is the particular problem of life or organic matter or how are the relationships of different atomic, <sup>&</sup> electrons and ions around each other- that then there is something that either <sup>one</sup> or the other kind of performers and I include in that now scientists and the totality of <sup>that kind of</sup> mankind wishing to create- that then in that attempt <sup>of them</sup> something has to be put which is represented or which is the representation in themselves of that ~~what~~ what is the highest in them as a form of life- then hoping that by introducing that and that what is their product of creation- will have the same <sup>quality</sup> property. If that is there it is justified- ~~then it is~~ <sup>that is</sup> of course the highest form of art and in them it reaches <sup>a</sup> the possibility of objectivity- because it's exactly in the giving in that creation that I free the bondage of myself and whenever it has to do with reaching liberty- that what I really pray then it is the fulfillment of my life as long as I can continue to live without having to depend on the conditions of earth. It's a very interesting chapter this Art- <sup>and</sup> it's interesting to think about it- and to see in how far- <sup>(our kind of)</sup> artists- how far they're removed from it.

Q: <sup>What</sup> Could I continue. I <sup>happened</sup> ~~happened~~ to think that there is let's say one or two plays which I know which I would consider- trying to reach towards something ~~more~~ objective.

M.N.: I think there are many who try. <sup>^</sup> You see some perhaps reach a little further than others. I'm quite certain that certain things ~~& have been produced & have been created~~ exist ~~which happen to reach that-~~ which have been created- which have that kind of a quality. I don't want to deny it. I don't want to say-

everything's subjective or to say that Beethoven was an unconscious man or Michelangelo. How do I know- but that there are certain things that I <sup>now</sup> know from my standpoint- can appreciate in a certain way or that affects me- ~~or that affects me~~ in a certain way that it almost becomes for me an objective art. Or the totality of what <sup>that</sup> is viewed or taken in by mankind becomes the same kind of- or has the same kind of affect on everybody. It also would be an indication of its objectivity. You see, so that <sup>lets</sup> I say- of the Ninth symphony of Beethoven- that what is the choir and you remember <sup>how it is with</sup> ~~that what is the~~ Freude schöne Gotterfunk Töchter ans Eysium. You know this

How marvelous it is

in its simplicity that at such a time you cannot say that man at that time did <sup>it</sup> not see God. You cannot say it. It would be idiotic because we don't know it. And whatever <sup>may have</sup> ~~made him~~ gone on and Beethoven in his deafness- as far as his life and his soul is concerned, You cannot say the man did not Work on himself even if he didn't know Gurdjieff. So you see it is quite idiotic to be too- let's call it too provincial. And each person has a certain right to assume that that what is produced has a certain quality and one cannot really judge about it until one has reached that kind of quality oneself. Then you can recognize it as something that has existed or does exist in that way and has the characteristics <sup>of it</sup> ~~of it~~. A person who is Awake will know ~~who is~~ Awake. But not until you are Awake will you know what is Awakeness and Awareness in someone else. It is that kind of a thing that I never will be

able to know what it is to be on a higher level. <sup>until I get there because</sup> I will know about a lower level. It's always a difference between light and darkness, In darkness I <sup>don't</sup> will know light but in light <sup>I</sup> ~~don't~~ know darkness because it's <sup>the absence of</sup> ~~darkness~~ in light. So- well you see we start philosophizing again.

( ) Who of you have read- who have been interested enough in reading Gurdjieff's "All and Everything"? Come on- no more- no more- <sup>ought</sup> you ought to be ashamed. <sup>you know</sup> Oh I wish I could make you feel ashamed <sup>of yourself</sup> of yourself.

when I am  
on a higher  
level



You haven't even touched it. Perhaps you even don't know it. As a task you go and get the book and start reading and then you'll see for yourself. You won't like it you know, and probably after a little while you will consider it a waste of money. Never through it away. You never know what might happen in the future. And someday <sup>you</sup> maybe you'll look at it as something that was money worthwhile spent. If that is the conclusion you can reach- I would almost say there is hope for you. But if it isn't I'm very much afraid. I mean this in all sincerity. Because a person is not a person only on this earth. A person is <sup>innerly</sup> inwardly really what he is. But in order to develop that he has to Work. And in order to Work- he has to be able to understand the conditions under which he lives and he has to know what binds him. And he only will know what he is bound by by understanding his subjectivity and his mechanicalness and his automatism. If he doesn't want to understand that he will never get anywhere. If he is closed <sup>his eyes are</sup> or if his eyes are closed or immuned or if he is smug or whatever it is that closes him <sup>up of course he will be living on his life, when</sup> and he will die at the proper time. But there is something that is <sup>really</sup> alive in man that keeps on being alive and never will die because that is the function of life, Why should life exist when it <sup>can</sup> could die. Life never exists then only in certain conditions as a form <sup>when</sup> the form is there it is encased, When it is not there it is life free. It is always in existence. There is no death. There is only a changeability of form and that therefore that what one starts to recognize as being alive in one- when one knows it- that it exists- you take on <sup>the</sup> responsibility for the maintenance of that. And in order to reach a different kind of a level, you have to do away with that what is subjective in the introduction of what we now call Objectivity. I would almost say <sup>that is</sup> the only way out of this earth- away from this earth- the possibility of <sup>the development of</sup> something that could become harmonious